DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 310 95 CE 005 138

AUTHOR Crawford, Robert L.; Jesser, David L.
TITLE The Status and Progress of Career Education.
INSTITUTION Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 75
CONTRACT OEC-0-74-3537
NOTE 85p.; Tables will reproduce poorly

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; Curriculum Development; Educational Finance; Educational Trends; Evaluation Methods; Leadership; *National Surveys; *State Agencies; *State Departments of Education; State Legislation; *State of the Art Reviews; State Programs; State Standards; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

The second national project in career education to be sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers was intended to provide for continued collaboration with State directors/coordinators, to add significantly to the body of career education knowledge in the various States and State education agencies (SEA), and to strengthen State leadership. It attempted to ascertain the status of career education in the States, the use of newly developed curricular materials, trends of growth, and State evaluation methods. Information was obtained exclusively from SEA personnel responsible for career education, as the SEA is considered to be the critical agency within the educational system's organizational hierarchy. From the available data (presented and discussed in the report), it is concluded that the general status of career education is good. The data suggest that there have been gains for career education in the various States in these areas: (1) SEA career education positions, (2) numbers of pupils involved in career education, (3) inservice teacher programs, (4) State legislation, (5) appropriation of State funds, (6) use of Federal monies, (7) State plans, (8) State advisory councils, (9) evaluation techniques and instruments, and (10) establishment of career education as an SEA priority. (Author/AJ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

SEP 23 1975

OEC-0-74-3537

ED117310

The Status and Progress of Career Education

Prepared by

Robert L. Crawford, Virginia State Department of Education

and

David L. Jesser, Project Director

CE005138

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Council of Chief State School Officers
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

May, 1975

The work reflected herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors and agencies undertaking such studies are sponsored by the Government and are encouraged to freely exercise their professional judgment in the conduct and reporting of such projects. Opinions and points of view stated do not necessarily, therefore, represent official Office of Education policy or position.

FOREWORD

During the past decade--especially during the period from 1965 to 1975--the American educational system has been the target of considerable criticism. At the same time, it has been the perceived source, or cause, of many social concerns. In response to the criticism and concern, numerous new programs have been developed and implemented, revised emphases and priorities have been formulated, and various and diverse target groups or populations have been identified as having special needs. Early Childhood Education, Bilingual Education, Adult Education, Right to Read, and Special Education are representative of the types of new programs and emphases that have appeared on the education scene. Each of these has addressed a specific concern or an entire set of specific concerns. Each has made--and no doubt will continue to make--significant contributions that hopefully will lead to solutions of the vexing and perplexing problems of society. All have impacted greatly upon society. All have impacted greatly upon society and education.

However, of all the changes in either programs or emphases that have been suggested in American education--including those of the past decade--none has met with such "instant acceptance" as the relatively new concept of Career Education.

There are those who would not accept the assumption just made. And there are those who would refute the idea that Career Education, as a basic educational concept, is in fact "new". It is nonetheless true that the concept, as such, was introduced to American education by the then Commissioner of Education, Sidney P. Marland, in early 1971. In this context, the concept must be perceived as "new".

Since the concept of Career Education was introduced by Dr. Marland in 1971, it has grown and spread rapidly across the nation.

The acceptance of the concept by educators (who sometimes have been charged with being conservative where educational change is concerned), together with the rapidity with which it has taken place, clearly indicates that Career Education is indeed a concept "whose time has come."

The rapid rate of acceptance at the same time tends also to underscore, in another manner, the significance of the concept. Traditionally there has been a very real time lag between the introduction of an educational innovation and its general or widespread acceptance by educators. It has been estimated, for example, that a lag of from 35 to 50 years existed between the introduction of the motion picture projector and its widespread acceptance as a bona fide teaching tool. Similar lags--perhaps not as long--can be found between the introduction and general or widespread acceptance of any number of educational technologies, methodologies, and techniques, including educational television, computer-assisted instruction, "new mathematics", and individualized instruction. In this context, the brevity of the lag between the introduction and general acceptance of Career Education must indeed be considered remarkable.

But while it is possible to explain the rapidity of acceptance of Career Education by saying that "its time has come," the real reasons, obviously, go far beyond such a "non-statement". Other considerations are necessary if it (the rapidity) is to be adequately explained.

First, it must be kept in mind that the concept of Career Education, as it is preceived by many, represents more of a response to a call for reform in American education than it does a call for reform itself. The concept of Career Education does not call for complete

or even the partial re-shaping of education or educational programs. Instead, it asks that certain changes be made within the structure of the existing educational system. For many educators and other concerned citizens, the concept of Career Education holds considerable promise for eliminating or at least alleviating a major portion of the sources of criticisms which has been directed toward the education system, not creating a separate or new system of education, but by making adjustments in the existing one.

The second consideration that should be kept in mind, when comparing the non-acceptance or slow acceptance of certain educational innovations with the more rapid acceptance of Career Education, relates rather directly to a fundamental principle of change: People tend to accept to support a given change in almost direct proportion to the degree that they perceive the need for the change. In other words, people are more likely to accept a particular change if they understand the need for it. In the case of Career Education, educators, governing boards, legislatures, and concerned citizens have been able to understand the reasons why the concept of Career Education--as a change in focus--is needed in the educational system. It is obvious that such groups and individuals have been helped, in a variety of ways, to understand the urgency of the need for the educational change that Career Education represents.

A number of forces or factors have converged, as it were, to make it possible for various publics to understand the need for, and thus accept the concept of, Career Education. There have been individual proponents or advocates at the national level, including Sidney Marland, Kenneth Hoyt, Keith Goldhammer, Gordon Swanson and Corrine Reider. Additionally, there have been collective or organi-

zational proponents at the national level, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Advisory Council for Vocational Education, the National Advisory Council on Adult Education, the U.S. Office of Education, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Advisory Council for Career Education. And, from a variety of sources, there has been produced a veritable fund of knowledge about Career Education, including Essays on Career Education, Career Education: What Is It and How to Do It, Career Education and the Gifted, Career Education: Perspective and Promise, Career Education and the Elementary Teacher, and Career Education: A Priority of the Chief State School Officers.

The individuals, groups, and various publications, have each in its own peculiar fashion, contributed greatly to the understanding of Career Education that has developed, and which is so essential to its acceptance. Those mentioned have all been either situated at or distributed from the national level, and they have had significant impact. But without negating or minimizing the contributions that have occurred at or emanated from the national level, it must be kept in mind that it is in the states "where the action is." It is in the states that things are accomplished, and where educational benefits accrue to the learners.

In the United States, the locus of responsibility for public education rests in the individual states, and it is in the states--in the educational systems which have been created--that every educational innovation, including Career Education, must ultimately be tested and either accepted or rejected.

There has been considerable testing of Career Education in these systems, together with the rather widespread acceptance that has been

noted. The fact that a climate in which such testing can occur is a marked tribute to the type of educational leadership that has been demonstrated time and time again at the state level. Without the leadership and assistance that has been provided at the state level--by the chief state school officers and state directors/coordinators of Career Education--the impact of the national efforts would have been minimized, to say the least.

However, with solid support and real leadership at the state level, it has been possible for state after state to help more and more people--citizens, educators, legislators, etc.--understand the urgency of the need for the change in education which Career Education represents. And because such understanding has occurred, at the state and local level, there has been a very broad acceptance of the concept, as this report will show.

The acceptance of the concept of Career Education reflects, obviously, the combined efforts of various publics. In the considered opinion of the writer, however, the efforts that have been made at the state level of education by the chief state school officer and those who have been assigned the responsibility for developing and implementing Career Education in the schools have been crucial in whatever successes the overall movement has had.

David L. Jesser

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Foreword	i
Introduction	1
Section One	
The Status of Career Education	6
State Leadership in Career Education	8
State Directors/Coordintors of Career Education	9
Relative Position in the Organizational Structure	12
Sources of Funding for Positions of Career Education Leadership	15
Pupil Involvement in Career Education	17
Involvement of Teachers in Career Education In-Service Efforts	24
Additional Indicators	29
Analysis and Synthesis	31
Section Two	
Evaluation: Problems, Status, and Prospects	36
Purposes and Goals of Evaluation	36
Evaluative Efforts at the State Level	39
The Status of Evaluation in the States	41
State Plans for Evaluation	42
Types of Data Being Collected	44
Levels of Occurrence	45
Evaluative Instruments and Methods	48
Observations	50
Section Three	
State Legislation for Career Education	51
Analyses of State Legislation	56
Arizona	56
Arkansas	57
Colorado	58
Florida	59
Hawaii	59
Iowa	60

PAGE

Analyses of State Legislation (continued)

Kansas	60
Louisiana	60
Michigan	61
New Jersey	62
Ohio	62
Vermont	62
Virginia	63
Washington	63

Section Four

Conclusions/Implications 64

General Status of Career Education	64
Evaluation of Career Education	68
Implications	70

Appendices

TABLES

NUMBER	TITLE	PAGE
I	Titles of SEA Personnel Having Responsibility for Career Education	11
II	Relative Position in Organizational Structure	13
III	Sources of Funding for Career Education Leadership Positions	16
IV	Percentages of Elementary Pupils in, Career Education: 1972-73; 1973-74	20
V	Percentage of Enrollment of Middle and High School Students in Career Education in Selected States, 1972-73; 1973-74	22
VI	Number and Percent of Elementary Teachers Participating in Career Education Programs in 28 States During 1973-74	25
VII	Number and Percent of Secondary Teachers Participating in Career Education In-Service Programs in 27 States During 1973-74	27
VIII	State Advisory Councils for Career Education	30
IX	State Plans Relating to Evaluation of Career Education Efforts	43
X	Evaluative Data Gathered	46
XI	Levels At Which Evaluation Occurs	47
XII	Instruments and Methods Used for Evaluation	49
XIII	Career Education Legislation in the States	52

Introduction

When the concept of Career Education was introduced to American educators by then U.S. Commissioner of Education Sidney P. Marland, one of the first major educational organizations to endorse the concept was the Council of Chief State School Officers. Since its initial endorsement, the Council, in the intervening years, has continued to actively endorse and support the concept as a major needed thrust or change in American education as is evidenced by the wording contained in one of the resolutions adopted by the Council at its 1974 Annual Meeting:

> The Council of Chief State School Officers believes that preparation for careers should be a basic component of education and pledges its commitment to this principle.
> (IV-D; 1974 CCSSO Resolution)

Indicative also of the support by the Council of the concept of Career Education is the fact that it (the Council) has established and maintained, for the past three years, either a special Task Force on Career Education (1973) or a regular Committee on Career Education (1974-75). The 1973 Task Force, it should be noted, was established for the purpose of examining possible roles (or involvement) of the Council in Career Education efforts. As a result of the work of the Task Force, the Council established the more formalized Committee on Career Education that has been a part of the Council structure for the past two years.

The Task Force and Committees have served to provide the Council with guidance, and at the same time to provide demonstrable support for the concept of Career Education. Both functions are illustrated in the recommendations made by the 1974 Committee to the Council membership in June, 1974, which is reproduced *en toto* in Appendix A.

[The statement and recommendations, contained in Appendix A,

according to informed sources, were instrumental in keeping legislative provisions for Career Education "alive".]

All of the actions taken by the Council in support of the concept of Career Education have contributed significantly to its acceptance and growth. However, perhaps the most visible action has been the active involvement of the Council in the operation (with the assistance of Federal funds from Part I of the Vocational Education Act) of two national projects concerned with Career Education.

The first national project concerned with Career Education that was sponsored by the Council was titled "Career Education in Public Education: Mission, Goals and Methods". Funded (OEG-0-73-1369) in 1973 for a twelve-month grant period, this project represented an attempt to provide Council members, SEA staff personnel, educational leaders, legislators, and educational practitioners with various kinds or types of information about Career Education. Additionally, it was the intent of the project to gather, assimilate, and disseminate information about Career Education implementation efforts in the several states, and for the project staff to actively work with SEA personnel having responsibility for Career Education at the state level.

During the initial project several progress and special reports, including one titled Career Education: Alive and Well?, were prepared and distributed. The bulk of the information gained, however was included in and disseminated through the project report: Career Education An Educational Priority for the Seventies. [This has since been republished by Olympus Publishing Company, in commercial form, under the title, Career Education: A Priority of the Chief State School Officers.]

The major report of the initial project was prepared under the overall direction of the project director, Dr. David L. Jesser. The

report was divided into five sections: "The Concept of Career Education"; Purposes and Goals of Career Education"; "Development and Utilization of Curriculum Materials for Career Education"; "Models, Elements, and Characteristics of Career Education"; and "Career Education and the SEA". Assisting Dr. Jesser in the preparation of the report were four SEA people having responsibilities for Career Education: Ms. Linda Keilholtz (Ohio); Mr. Byron Vanier (Nebraska); Ms. Nancy Pinson (Maryland); and Mr. E. Niel Carey (Maryland).

Copies of the report were distributed to every chief state school officer, to SEA personnel responsible for Career Education, to various components of the United States Office of Education, and to other interested institutions and agencies (within the limits of the existing supply).

As can be inferred, the report appeared to meet at least some of the needs of both state leaders responsible for Career Education and those practitioners in the field responsible for "making it work."

But while the report accomodated some of the needs, it at the same time suggested that there were unanswered questions, and that considerably more information was needed. Subsequently, the Council sought, and received, federal funds to support an attempt (through a national project) to provide answers for at least some of the questions or problem areas.

This second national project in Career Education to be sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers was titled "The Status and Progress of Career Education" (OEC-0-74-3537) and was perceived as a logical follow-up to the activities relating to the initial project. In addition to providing for a continuation of the collaboration with state directors/coordinators, the project was intended to be a means

of adding significantly to the already existing body or fund of knowledge relating to Career Education in the various states and state education agencies.

- What (in terms of Career Education) is really happening at the state level?
- How, and to what degree, is the SEA involved in Career Education efforts?
- Who (both in the SEA and around the state) is involved in Career Education efforts?
- What kinds of funds (in terms of source and amount) are being utilized to support Career Education and related activities?

Questions such as the preceding were being asked, and it was thought that answers might be found. The project therefore attempted to ascertain, to the degree possible, the status of Career Education in the states, the use of newly developed curricular materials, patterns (or trends) of growth or evolvement, and methods used in the states for purposes of evaluating the effectiveness of Career Education.

It should be noted that the second (or current) Career Education project sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers was conceived primarily as a means of strengthening state leadership in Career Education. It was therefore designed so as to function totally in concert with state education agencies and those SEA personnel responsible for Career Education. Information, while reflecting the status of Career Education within the several states, has been obtained exclusively from these sources. No attempt has been made, nor was it the intent of the project, to obtain information and/or data from sources other than SEA personnel.

As indicated in the preface, it is the position of the Council

that the SEA is the critical agency within the organizational hierarchy of the educational system. It is in the states--and as a result of actiors by the SEA and other state governmental agencies--that things happen which cause educational benefits to accrue to learners. The focus of this effort, as reported here, therefore, is and has been on the state level of educational governance.

Section One

The Status of Career Education

Any attempt to describe, in a meaningful manner, the status of Career Education in the several states and extra-state jurisdictions is, at least, a difficult task. Some might well be tempted to define the task as being impossible rather than "difficult". But regardless of the difficulties or obstacles which are perceived to exist, advocates and/or proponents of Career Education--those who perceive and support the concept as a viable means of effecting major reforms or changes in the educational system--have a very real and very basic responsibility to make the attempt. People in and out of education are asking questions about Career Education. They have a right to know, to the degree possible, the answers.

Over the past several years, many people in all segments of society have been helped to understand the need, and the urgency of the need, for the inclusion (or infusion) of the concept of Career Education into the total educational system. And as a result of such understanding, there have been significant developmental efforts made throughout the nation.

It seems reasonable to assume, after the support which has been demonstrated, that concerned citizens, legislators, governmental executives, and educational leaders are entitled to know what has happened as a result of their efforts. In other words, they should be informed about the status of Career Education.

Yet to reiterate, the status is difficult to describe in a manner that will be meaningful to a diverse set of publics. And there appear to be several valid reasons for the difficulty.

For one thing, because of the relative recency of the introduction of the concept into the educational community, there is a paucity of

baseline (or prior) information. This in itself contributes to the problem, because unless there are bases for comparison, the status will not have too much meaning. If data collected are to have some degree of relevance beyond simply "what is", there must be a capability for objective comparison.

In the case of Career Education, much data which would be helpful in making such comparisons simply do not exist.

Another factor which contributes to the difficulty noted relates to what might best be termed the "infancy" of Career Education. In this developmental stage, it has been relatively easy for its proponents, and its practitioners, to describe it in terms of their hopes for what it might be "when it grew up." Additionally, in this stage of development, it was not difficult to arrive at a consensus agreement relating to the future (in terms of perceived hopes) of Career Education. This still seems to be the case, so long as the discussion centers about hopes and expectations.

It is not quite as true, however, when discussion centers on what Career Education is or looks like, because, as it has grown and developed, Career Education has indeed evolved into a variety of shapes or forms. The growth has taken place in differing ways and rates, and has resulted in differing focus and products. This collectively contributes to the difficulty that is encountered when any attempt is made to describe Career Education as a single entity or monolithic program.

Still another factor responsible, in part, for the difficulty encountered in describing Career Education relates directly to the many and diverse methods that are used to record and report information about Career Education in the various states. Because of this

diversity, there may be what appear to be conflicting or diverse reports, even though those doing the reporting or recording may well be describing the same thing.

The reasons for the difficulties are not offered in any sense of apology. Neither are they offered in any negative sense. The states which have contributed information for this report have without exception supported the contention made earlier that there has been a remarkable growth in and acceptance of Career Education. All of the data seem to support the idea that Career Education is strong and healthy. At the same time, however, the data in some instances would also support the notion that the actual status of Career Education is difficult to ascertain.

State Leadership in Career Education

As has been indicated, suggested, or reported in numerous publications (including this one), the leadership role or function of the state education is perceived to be critical to the total Career Education movement. Stated in another fashion, the ultimate success of efforts designed to implement, or infuse, the concept of Career Education into the overall educational system depends on the leadership which is demonstrated in and through the state education agency. Such leadership, as will be noted, does exist. The preceding statement, however, does not and should not imply (or cause to be inferred) that the leadership role and function is identical in every state education agency. Just as there differing styles of leadership found in individuals, so are there differing manifestations of leadership in the various state education agencies. And so long as there are unique individuals and unique institutional organizations, this is no doubt

the way it ought to be.

But what about state leadership in Career Education? Where is it, and what does it look like? An examination of such leadership may provide a beginning of understanding of the status of Career Education throughout the nation.

State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education

Virtually every state or extra-state jurisdiction has, within its education agency, at least one professional staff member who has been assigned responsibility for directing or coordinating efforts on behalf of Career Education. These SEA personnel are, and have been referred to as "State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education". This seems to describe at least a part of their professional responsibilities. However, the fact that such responsibilities have been assigned should not imply that there is at the same time an exclusivity of responsibility, i.e., for Career Education only. Some SEA personnel do have such exclusive responsibility; others have several. This is indicated by the titles of SEA positions held by those responsible for Career Education.

Fifty-five of the fifty-seven jurisdictions (all states and seven extra-state jurisdictions) report the existence of a staff member responsible for Career Education. The position titles of such people, however, do not present any sense of uniformity or unanimity in terms of description. It is true, as the data shown in Table I indicate, that there is among the position titles a degree of "clustering" around the term, Career Education. Again, however, the titles themselves display a considerable degree of variance in description.

As the data contained in Table I indicate, thirty-eight states and extra-state jurisdictions link, in fairly direct fashion, the agency person responsible for Career Education efforts to the concept itself by including the term in the position title. In the remaining seventeen states (in which a person having responsibilities for Career Education was listed) the position titles contain a wide variety of terms, including curriculum, vocational, guidance, staff development, instructional improvement, industrial education, and the like.

The diversity of position titles shown in Table I illustrates, to some degree, differences which exist among the states. There are rather significant differences in sources of funding for Career Education; there are differences in terms of organizational structure; there are differences in terms of emphasis. The differing position titles hint at such differences.

It would be wrong, however, to dwell on the differences which are evident. Emphasis should instead be given to the similarities that Table I describes. As has been noted, thirty-eight titles are directly linked to "Career Education". This is some 70 per cent of the states or jurisdictions noted. The fact that such a high percentage of agencies had, in 1974, a person responsible for Career Education efforts would be clear evidence of the growth which has taken place since 1968, when only one state agency had such a person on its staff. When it is noted that this percentage (70) reflects the number of agencies in which the title is directly linked to the concept, the status of Career Education in state education agencies is impressive.

Equally impressive, however, is the fact that, regardless of

TABLE I

TITLES OF SEA PERSONNEL HAVING RESPONSIBILITY

FOR CAREER EDUCATION

STATE	TITLE
Alabama	State Coordinator, Career Education
Alaska	State Director, Career and Vocational Education
Arizona	Associate Superintendent, Career and Vocational Education
Arkansas	Supervisor of Career Education
California	Manager, Career Education Task Force
Canal Zone	Director of Curriculum
Colorado	Supervisor - Career Education
Connecticut	Consultant, Career Education
Delaware	State Supervisor of Curriculum Research for Vocational Educ.
District of Columbia	Project Coordinator, Career Education Component
Florida	Career Education Coordinator
Georgia	Director, Division of Program and Staff Development
Guam	Assistant Superintendent, Career Education
Hawaii	Administrator - Vocational-Technical Education
Idaho	Chief, Instructional Improvement Division
Illinois	Career Education Specialist
Indiana	Coordinator - Career Exploration and Guidance
Iowa	Director, Career Education
Kansas	Career Education Coordinator
Louisiana	Director, Career Education
Maine	Consultant, Career Education
Maryland	Specialist in Vocational Guidance and Chairman, Career Education Task Force
Massachusetts	Director, Project CAREER
Michigan	Special Assistant to the Superintendent for Career Education
Minnesota	Consultant, Pupil Personnel Services
Mississippi	State Coordinator of Career Education
Missouri	Director of Career Education
Montana	Career Education Development Coordinator
Nebraska	Career Education Consultant
Nevada	Assistant Director, Office of Educational Accountability
New Hampshire	Career Education Consultant
New Jersey	Director, Career Development
New Mexico	State Coordinator, Career Education
New York	Coordinator, Career Education
North Carolina	Special Assistant for Alternative Education
North Dakota	Career Education Specialist
Ohio	Assistant Director, Division of Vocational Education, Career Development Services
Oklahoma	Coordinator, Guidance & Counseling Section
Oregon	Director, Career and Vocational Education
Pennsylvania	Research Associate
Puerto Rico	Executive Director - State Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Rhode Island	Coordinator, Career Education Project
South Carolina	State Consultant, Career Education
South Dakota	Administrator, Guidance and Counseling Services
Tennessee	Director, Research and Curriculum, Vocational Education
Texas	Director of Career Education
Utah	Coordinator, Career Education Unit
Vermont	Consultant - Career Education and Vocational Guidance
Virginia	State Supervisor for Career Education
Virgin Islands	Trade and Industrial Education
Washington	State Supervisor of Career Education
West Virginia	Coordinator of Career Education
Wisconsin	Education Consultant - Career Education
Wyoming	Career Education Coordinator

the wording of individual position titles, 55 of 57 state (or extra-state) education agencies were able to report, in 1974, the existence of a professional staff member to whom responsibility for Career Education had been assigned. In 1968, only two percent were able to note the existence of such a person. In 1974--six years later--some 96 percent of the agencies were able do so. Again, this must be considered as reflective of both the growth and status of Career Education.

Relative Position in Organizational Structure

Descriptive information concerning the status of Career Education at the state level is, obviously, obtainable from data presented in Table I. It is also possible, however, to obtain descriptive information form an examination of the relative position of the State Director/Coordinator (the SEA person having assigned responsibility) within the organizational structure of the state education agency. To whom does the Director/Coordinator report? In what branch of the SEA is this person located? Answers to questions such as these will also provide useful information.

As the data contained in Table II indicate, the person having assigned responsibility for Career Education efforts reports directly to the chief state school officer or the deputy chief in eight agencies. In nineteen agencies, the State Director/Coordinator reports to the person responsible for the Vocational Education program (either Associate Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, or Director), while in eighteen agencies the line of reporting goes to the person having responsibilities for Instructional Services (either Associate Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, or Director). Four agencies indicate reportability to the person responsible for guidance, while

TABLE II

RELATIVE POSITION IN ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

State	State Director/Coordinator Reports to:
Alabama	State Supervisor Career Services
Alaska	Commissioner of Education
Arizona	Associate Superintendent for Career & Vocational Education
Arkansas	State Director of Education
California	Associate Superintendent of Secondary Education
Canal Zone	Superintendent of Schools
Colorado	Commissioner of Education
Delaware	Director, Vocational Education
District of Columbia	Project Director, ESAA Programs
Florida	Bureau Chief - Vocational & Adult Education
Georgia	Associate State Superintendent for Instructional Services
Guam	Associate Superintendent; Careers & Occupations
Hawaii	Director of General Education
Idaho	Deputy Superintendent for Educational Services
Illinois	Director of Instructional Services
Indiana	State Director, Vocational Education
Iowa	Director of Career Education
Kansas	Assistant Commissioner for Vocational Education
Kentucky	Assistant Superintendent for Vocational Education
Louisiana	Assistant Superintendent for Instructional Services
Maine	Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Vocational Education
Maryland	Coordinator, Pupil Services; Division of Instruction
Massachusetts	Associate Commissioner for Occupational Education
Michigan	Superintendent of Public Instruction
Minnesota	Director, Pupil Personnel Services
Mississippi	Director, Vocational & Technical Education
Missouri	Assistant Commissioner, Career & Adult Education (Vocational Education)
Montana	Director, Special & General Services
Nebraska	Administrator, Student Personnel Services
Nevada	Director, Office of Educational Accountability
New Hampshire	Commissioner of Education
New Jersey	Associate Director of Ancillary Services; Division of Vocational Education
New Mexico	Director, Technical Assistance Unit, Division of Instruction
North Carolina	Deputy Assistant Superintendent; Program Services
North Dakota	Assistant Director, Vocational Education
Ohio	Director, Vocational Education
Oklahoma	Administrator, Guidance & Counseling Section
Oregon	Associate Superintendent, Division of Instructional Services
Pennsylvania	Commissioner for Basic Education
Puerto Rico	Chairman, State Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Rhode Island	Director, Alternative Learning Center; Division of Development & Operations
South Carolina	Director of Vocational Education
South Dakota	State Superintendent
Tennessee	Assistant Commissioner, Vocational-Technical Education
Texas	Deputy Commissioner, Educational Programs & Personnel Development
Utah	Associate Superintendent, Office of Instructional Services
Vermont	Deputy Commissioner of Education
Virginia	Assistant Superintendent for Public Instruction
Virgin Islands	Supervisor, Division of Vocational-Technical Education
Washington	Assistant Superintendent, Division of Vocational Education
West Virginia	Director, Program Services; Bureau of Vocational-Technical & Adult Education
Wisconsin	Bureau of Career & Manpower Development; Instructional Services Division
Wyoming	Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

one indicates that it be made to the project director. Three agencies indicate the existence of an overall supervisory capability in the person of an Associate Superintendent for or State Director of Career Education.

The data show that in a majority of states in the reporting line goes to the Vocational Education segment of the agency. Unfortunately, this information could (and in some instances may) be used to support the idea--as expressed by John Sessions, Welford Wilms, and others--that Career Education is really just a new name for the older and more established Vocational Education.

Rather than being indicative or supportive of that idea, the data instead are suggestive of the source of funds used to support Career Education efforts. Historically, the vast preponderance of funds to be used for Career Education were taken from those budgeted for various provisions of the Vocational Education Act. This was true at the national level, and it obviously carried through at the state level. It is understandable, therefore, that lines of communication have been established with and through funding sources. Again, any inference that in <u>every</u> state the lines of communication reflect funding sources must be avoided. There are, for example, states in which the reportability is to the chief, yet the primary funding source is Vocational Education funds, as is the case in Michigan. There does seem to be a relationship, in a general sense, between funding sources and lines of communication. And to the extent that this assumption is acceptable, one would have to surmise that in most state education agencies, to support the Career Education leadership position are derived from Vocational Education sources.

Sources of Funding for Positions of Career Education Leadership

Several insights into the status of state leadership in Career Education can be gained from an examination of position titles and lines of reportability, as has been done in the preceding sections. Still further insights, however, can be gained from an examination of the sources of funds used to support the leadership positions in the state education agencies. Accordingly, State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education (SEA personnel having responsibility for Career Education) were asked about the source (or sources) of funding for their positions. Fifty-two (of 57) states or extra-state jurisdictions responded to this query; the data are presented in Table III.

As the data in Table III indicate, Career Education leadership positions in 22 states (42.3 percent of responding states or extra-state jurisdictions) were supported by federal funds. Of those indicating the source as federal, the majority identify with Vocational Education (VEA) funding sources. Some, however, derive support from other federal sources such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA V and ESEA III) and the Emergency School Assistance Act (ESAA).

Of the reporting states or extra-state jurisdictions, 19, or 33 percent, indicated state funds (or the equivalent) as the source of support for the positions. Eight states or extra-state jurisdictions, or nearly 16 percent of those responding, indicated the funding source as being some combination of federal/state funds.

In an earlier section it was pointed out that because of the close relationships between Vocational Education and Career Education there sometimes is a tendency to view Career Education as "a new

TABLE III

SOURCES OF FUNDING FOR CAREER EDUCATION LEADERSHIP POSITIONS

STATE	SOURCES OF FUNDING (1971)
Alabama	State
Alaska	State/Federal
Arizona	State
Arkansas	State
California	Federal: VEA
Canal Zone	Canal Zone Government (District)
Colorado	Federal: Title V, ESEA
Connecticut	Federal: VEA
Delaware	Federal
District of Columbia	Emergency School Aid Act
Florida	State
Georgia	State
Guam	State
Hawaii	State
Idaho	State
Illinois	State
Indiana	State/Federal
Iowa	State/Federal
Kansas	Federal: EPDA (F)
Kentucky	State/Federal (Vocational Education)
Louisiana	State
Maine	Federal
Maryland	State/Federal
Massachusetts	Federal: VEA-1968
Michigan	Federal: Vocational
Minnesota	Federal: ESEA and Vocational
Mississippi	Federal: VEA B and C
Missouri	Federal: VEA Part D, 1968
Montana	Project VIEW
Nebraska	State
Nevada	Federal: Vocational Education Funds
New Hampshire	Federal: Vocational Education
New Jersey	State
New Mexico	State
North Carolina	State
North Dakota	Federal
Ohio	State/Federal (Part C)
Oklahoma	Federal: Vocational-Technical Education
Oregon	State/Federal
Pennsylvania	State
Rhode Island	Federal: Part C - P.L. 90-576
South Carolina	Federal: Part C - Section 131 (a) and Part B (VEA)
South Dakota	Federal
Tennessee	State/Federal (Vocational Education)
Texas	Federal: Title III; Vocational Education; Migrant
Utah	State
Vermont	State
Virginia	Federal: Vocational Education, Special Projects
Virgin Islands	Territorial Funds
Washington	State
West Virginia	State/Federal (VEA, 1968)
Wisconsin	Federal: Part B, VEA

name for Vocational Education." The data shown in Table III may be used by some to again justify this tendency, because of the fact that the majority of SEA positions for Career Education leadership are supported with federal funds. (And in this majority, most are supported with Vocational Education funds.)

Again, however, caution must be exercised when the data are interpreted, because, as can be seen, a total of 27 states or extra-state jurisdictions do not derive support for the SEA positions in Career Education exclusively from federal sources. Nineteen states or extra-state jurisdictions show state funds as the source, while eight show a combination of state and federal funds. Collectively, this amounts to nearly 48 percent of the responding states or extra-state jurisdictions. In other words, nearly one-half of the reporting agencies support the positions, in whole or in part, with state funds. This of course is not "proof-positive", but it is clear evidence that the state education agencies are assuming, and demonstrating, the responsibility for funding positions of leadership in Career Education.

Pupil Involvement in Career Education

As has already been noted, various problems arise when attempts are made to obtain data or meaningful statistics relating to different aspects of Career Education efforts throughout the nation. The causes of these problems are, in most instances, rather obvious. For example, some are caused by differences in the definition or interpretation of the concept of Career Education. Others may be caused by differences in modes of reporting data, and still others may reflect policies or statutes unique to a given state or state education agency. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that problems do exist, and this must be

taken into account when the status and/or progress is described. The point just made assumes particular significance when attempts are made to describe the numbers of pupils involved in, or enrolled in, Career Education efforts.

As an example, if a state education agency, by definition, includes Vocational Education in the framework or context of Career Education, does it then follow that all secondary students enrolled in Vocational Education programs are to be reported as participating in Career Education efforts? Or, in the case of industrial arts programs in junior and senior high school programs, should the students enrolled in these programs be reported as participating in Career Education programs? Obviously, if one subscribes to or agrees with the more commonly accepted totality of Career Education which includes both "hands-on" experiences and skill development, such students should be included. But there does not appear to be general agreement among the states in this regard. Consequently, some states do and some states don't include such students when reporting data about enrollment.

Interestingly, the type of problem just described does not seem to exist, or exists to a much lesser degree, at the elementary level. Data concerning elementary pupils have been somewhat easier to obtain from the states. This may reflect any number of things, but probably has to do with the willingness of elementary teachers and supervisors to adapt, and include, concepts of Career Educarion to and into the total elementary educational structure.

The preceding comments will need to be kept in mind when the data concerning elementary, middle, and secondary enrollments are reviewed. It should be emphasized that the cautions or caveats

alluded to do not in any way negate the validity of the data presented. They do suggest, however, that the data in some instances may be either incomplete or reflective of differing interpretations.

Data relating to involvement or enrollment of elementary pupils in some form of Career Education efforts during the 1972-73 and 1973-74 school years are presented in Table IV. These data portray both the numbers of such pupils as well as the percentages of total elementary enrollments, and clearly illustrate the rate of growth which occurred between the two school years. The data also indicate the relative status of Career Education (as indicated by pupil involvement) in the various states in each of the two years. [NOTE: a few states or extra-state jurisdictions were unable to provide the data requested. Consequently, Table IV does not list all 57 jurisdictions.]

As can be seen from the data shown in Table IV, some states, such as Arizona, Delaware, Washington, and Wisconsin, indicated a relatively high degree of involvement, on the part of elementary pupils, in Career Education efforts during the 1972-73 school year. For these states, the data for the 1973-74 school year may not seem to reflect as great an increase as the data for other states may suggest. In every case, however, the "baseline information", or basis for comparison, must be kept in mind.

The data presented in Table IV clearly indicate that in virtually all of the reporting states there was an increase, from 1972-73 to 1973-74, in the number of elementary pupils who were participating, in some manner, in Career Education efforts. Perhaps the most spectacular increase is indicated in the data for New Mexico, where the enrollment jumped from about 10 percent in 1972-73 to nearly 100 percent in 1973-74. [Increases of this magnitude are not typical, as

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGES OF ELEMENTARY PUPILS IN,

CAREER EDUCATION: 1972-73; 1973-74

STATE	1972-73			1973-74		
	TOTAL ELEMENTARY ENROLLMENT[1]	ELEMENTARY STUDENTS IN CAREER EDUCATION[2]	PERCENT	TOTAL ELEMENTARY ENROLLMENT[1]	ELEMENTARY STUDENTS IN CAREER EDUCATION[2]	PERCENT
Arizona	373,770	123,000	32.9	386,858	165,800	42.8
Arkansas	239,918	26,250	10.9	240,865	30,235	12.5
California	2,745,737	16,000	.5	2,699,000	18,000	.6
Connecticut	478,528	30,000	6.2	469,720	45,000	9.5
Delaware	71,950	19,714	27.3	69,558	24,500	35.2
Florida	884,398	11,566	1.3	773,020	118,358	15.3
[illegible]gia	686,601	9,720	1.4	683,354	14,760	2.1
[illegible]iana	657,764	14,650	2.2	639,000	16,225	2.5
Iowa	357,597	50,489	14.1	349,800	84,149	24.0
Kansas	277,481	24,000	8.6	269,434	72,600	26.9
Kentucky	450,230	23,950	5.3	447,000	121,350	27.1
Maine	177,393	1,500	.8	174,566	2,000	1.1
Maryland	-------	------	----	491,463	115,000	23.3
Montana	116,980	1,500	1.2	113,900	3,000	2.6
Nebraska	180,058	1,000	.5	176,000	2,000	1.1
New Hampshire	96,819	2,000	2.0	102,135	4,000	3.9
New Jersey	972,483	35,000	3.5	967,200	75,000	7.7
New Mexico	14,391	15,000	10.3	140,114	138,454	98.8
New York	-------	------	----	1,829,150	60,638	3.3
North Carolina	799,709	4,000	.5	786,697	1,700	.2
Ohio	1,469,582	74,345	5.0	1,420,972	89,668	6.3
Oklahoma	333,144	3,008	.9	324,000	7,000	2.1
Pennsylvania	1,224,959	16,749	1.3	1,197,800	418,733	34.9
South Carolina	386,532	6,970	1.8	384,928	10,143	2.6
Texas	1,545,777	118,209	7.6	1,594,559	313,209	19.6
Utah	163,724	4,100	2.5	161,355	7,200	4.4
Washington	412,792	123,646	29.9	405,711	202,632	49.9
West Virginia	229,425	8,050	3.5	229,605	12,075	5.2
Wisconsin	574,918	210,000	36.5	564,255	280,000	49.6
TOTAL	16,052,866.00	974,408.00	6.0	18,092,019.00	2,453,[illegible]9.00	13.5

[1]Data obtained from NEA sources

[2]Data obtained from CCSSO sources

the remaining data indicate. Nonetheless, because of a policy which made Career Education a mandated part of the public elementary school educational program, this increase did occur in New Mexico.]

While the data from other states may not be as spectacular as the data from New Mexico, the increases in elementary enrollment (in Career Education efforts) of several states would seem to be quite significant. Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and Texas all indicate rather healthy gains.

The data shown in Table IV for the various states reflect the progress made in Career Education efforts in the elementary schools of the states. In terms of the individual states, the data which are impressive, it would seem, are the data presented on the "bottom line", for here can be seen the impact--and growth--of the concept of Career Education in the elementary schools of the nation.

As the "bottom line" data suggest, about six percent of the nation's elementary school pupils were involved in Career Education efforts in 1972-73. In the following school year (1973-74) the percentage of elementary pupils involved in Career Education efforts had more than doubled--from six to thirteen percent. Growth did indeed take place.

The data shown in Table IV reflect only the involvement of elementary pupils. As has been noted, meaningful data concerning junior and high school pupils have been more difficult to obtain. However, the absence of extensive "hard data" should certainly not be used to infer that there has not been active involvement of and participation by junior and senior high school students in Career Education efforts. Several states, as the data presented in Table V show, have had rather high percentages of students at both levels

TABLE V

PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLMENT OF MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN CAREER EDUCATION IN SELECTED STATES, 1972-73 AND 1973-74

STATES	PERCENTAGE OF MIDDLE SCHOOL PUPILS INVOLVED IN CAREER EDUCATION 1972-73	PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PUPILS 1972-73	PERCENT MIDDLE 1973-74	PERCENT HIGH SCHOOL 1973-74
Arizona	80	65	85	80
Delaware	56	47	74	68
Georgia	26	77	30	82
Iowa	10	56	15	69
Kansas	20	28	30	35
New Hampshire	5	20	10	25
Washington	12	90	24	100
Wisconsin	35	35	50	50

(junior or middle and senior) involved in Career Education efforts.

In examining the data presented in Table V, it should be kept in mind that less than 20 percent of the states are represented. When perceived in this context, it is obvious that no sweeping generalizations should be made. At the same time, the data should provide some sense of the degree of involvement, and the increased involvement, of middle and senior high school students in Career Education efforts.

It should be noted that individual State Directors/Coordinators were recently (April, 1975) queried as to the status and progress of Career Education in their respective states, and in their narrative statements the majority indicated that progress--significant progress--was occurring with regard to Career Education implementation and expansion efforts. The pattern suggested by the data presented in Tables IV and V, however, seemed also to be borne out by the information in the narrative statements. These suggest that the rate of progress, or of increases, in Career Education implementation efforts correlates in almost inverse fashion to the hierarchy of the system of public education. More is happening, and more growth is taking place, at the elementary level of education. Less seems to be happening in the middle schools, and the least action appears at the high school.

Some possible reasons for the inverse correlation which has been suggested have already been noted; others, however, would seem to be based in the "generalist" type of background of elementary teachers and the "specialist" type of training or background of high school teachers. The former, it would seem are more amenable to infusing basic concepts of Career Education into existing educational programs; the latter, apparently, find this more difficult to do. This, in turn,

strongly suggests or implies a need for considerable in-service efforts to be made in the field of secondary education. It also suggests that colleges and universities engaged in teacher preparation need to do more to help those students preparing to teach in secondary education to understand better the relationship of their area of specialization to the world of work in which they exist.

In a more general sense, the data would seem to indicate, however, that the concept of Career Education has become an integral part of the educational program or process for many American pupils, and that the number being served (or whose needs are being better met) increased considerably between the 1972-73 and 1973-74 school years.

Involvement of Teachers in Career Education In-Service Efforts

Data concerning state leaders in Career Education are useful as indicators of the status of the movement; so also are data relating to pupil enrollment or involvement. Still another dimension can be found in an examination of the data concerning involvement of teachers in in-service efforts relating to Career Education.

Twenty-eight states reported the existence of Career Education in-service programs for teachers during the 1972-73 school year. As the data presented in Table VI indicate, there were a total of 660,000 elementary teachers in these 28 states. Of that number, some 51,000 teachers participated in the in-service efforts. In other words, in the 28 reporting states, about 7.6 percent of all elementary teachers participated in Career Education in-service programs during the 1973-74 school year.

Some degree of caution, however, should be exercised when interpreting the data. As will be noted in Table VI the range of indivi-

TABLE VI

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS PARTICIPATING IN CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN 28 STATES DURING 1973-74

STATE (N-28)	TOTAL ELEMENTARY TEACHERS[1]	NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS[2]	PERCENT
Arizona	16,575	7,028	42.4
Arkansas	10,214	2,400	23.4
California	111,000	1,324	1.4
Colorado	12,415	750	6.0
Connecticut	18,985	600	3.1
Delaware	2,664	983	36.8
Florida	38,750	5,482	14.1
Georgia	30,305	932	3.0
Hawaii	4,015	100	2.4
Indiana	26,000	430	1.6
Iowa	14,498	220	1.5
Kansas	12,920	1,800	13.9
Kentucky	19,600	4,900	25.0
Maine	7,015	500	7.0
Maryland	21,939	6,780	30.9
Missouri	24,658	100	.4
Nebraska	9,450	750	7.9
New Hampshire	4,350	200	4.4
New Jersey	42,390	3,000	7.0
New Mexico	6,549	3,992	60.9
New York	88,886	2,846	3.2
North Carolina	34,391	1,850	5.3
Oklahoma	14,900	100	.6
Texas	71,922	12,000	16.0
Utah	6,285	2,200	35.0
Vermont	3,145	155	4.9
West Virginia	10,402	670	6.4
Wyoming	2,195	150	6.8
TOTAL	666,598	51,142	7.6

[1]Data from NEA Sources
[2]Data from CCSSO Survey

dual state percentage figures is considerable--from .4 percent in Missouri to 60.9 percent in New Mexico. Seven of the reporting states (Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, New Mexico, and Utah) indicate a participation rate for elementary teachers of over 20 percent. The preponderance of the reporting states (21), however indicate an involvement in Career Education in-service efforts by elementary teachers of less than 20 percent during the 1973-74 school year.

At the high school, or secondary school level, 27 states indicated the existence of secondary school in-service programs in Career Education during 1973-74. In the 27 reporting states, there were 525,574 secondary teachers, as the data presented in Table VII indicate. Of this number, a total of 44,520, or approximately eight percent, participated in in-service opportunities.

Again, caution should be exercised when attaching meaning to the data. The range of percentages, as will be noted in Table VII, extends from .5 percent to 48 percent.

The percentages noted for secondary teachers (in Table VII) compare somewhat favorably with the data concerning elementary teachers. Of the totals, it will be recalled that 7.6 percent of the elementary teachers (in the 28 reporting states) participated in in-service programs in 1973-74; approximately eight percent of the secondary teachers (in the 27 reporting states) participated. Similarly, where seven of the states indicated a participation rate of elementary teachers of 20 percent or better, six states (Arizona, Delaware, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas and Kentucky) were able to indicate the same (20 percent or better) participation rate for secondary teachers. Again, however, the preponderance of states (21) indicated

TABLE VII

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SECONDARY TEACHERS
PARTICIPATING IN CAREER EDUCATION IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS
IN 27 STATES DURING 1973-74

STATE (N - 27)	TOTAL SECONDARY TEACHERS[1]	NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS[2]	PERCENT
Arizona	6,164	2,990	48.5
Arkansas	10,010	1,595	15.9
California	74,108	1,162	1.5
Colorado	13,069	620	4.7
Connecticut	15,647	220	1.4
Delaware	3,587	1,633	45.5
Florida	33,595	776	2.3
Georgia	19,909	7,337	36.8
Hawaii	2,907	267	9.1
Indiana	26,377	140	.5
Iowa	16,361	7,850	47.9
Kansas	12,675	2,570	20.2
Kentucky	11,897	3,394	28.5
Maine	4,555	560	12.2
Missouri	23,860	775	3.2
Nebraska	8,764	1,100	12.5
New Hampshire	3,754	170	4.5
New Jersey	31,187	283	.9
New Mexico	5,971	317	5.3
New York	97,141	1,490	1.5
North Carolina	17,413	3,320	19.0
Oklahoma	13,664	400	2.9
Texas	67,886	3,900	5.7
Utah	6,143	730	11.8
Vermont	3,170	130	4.1
West Virginia	8,424	656	7.7
Wyoming	3,376	135	5.6
TOTAL	525,574	44,520	8.4

[1]Data from NEA Sources
[2]Data from CCSSO Survey

an in-service involvement of less than 20 percent of secondary teachers during 1973-74.

As has been noted throughout this report, it is difficult to attach a high degree of meaning to the data which are presented. There are differences in definition, differences in interpretation, and differences in reporting among the various states and extra-state jurisdictions. In the case of data concerned with teacher participation in in-service programs in Career Education, such differences no doubt are reflected. It is possible that some of the programs, for example, may well have been classified as something other than Career Education by some. Respondents, however, were asked to indicate only (1) the existence of such programs, and (2) the extent of participation; they were not asked to describe or define the programs other than in terms of "Career Education". It therefore would seem logical to assume that the data provided by the reporting states and extra-state jurisdictions are somewhat "all inclusive". In other words, it may be assumed that the respondent agencies included data on all in-service activities that had some relationship or relevance to Career Education.

Should such an assumption be acceptable, it would certainly imply a rather serious difference between involvement of pupils in Career Education activities and involvement of teachers in in-service opportunities. The data would also seem to imply the need--a rather urgent one--for some kind of concentrated effort to be made to help more teachers understand and accept the concept of Career Education. Such an effort has to be in the area of in-service programs.

Additional Indicators

During the course of examining, or looking at, the status of Career Education in the various state education agencies, additional data were obtained and could be reported in some detail. The additional data, however, while interesting and illuminating, more or less support the data and implications that have already been discussed, so they (the data) are not reported in detail here.

Generally speaking, in terms of professional preparation of SEA personnel responsible for Career Education, responsibilities in addition to Career Education of those SEA personnel, and recency of creation and assumption of their positions, the pattern suggests most definitely the "newness" of Career Education on the SEA scene. At the same time, the pattern also tends to reinforce the "piggy-backing" aspects of Career Education which has occurred during the early developmental stages of Career Education.

But while most of the additional data can and should be discussed in general terms, one final set of data should be useful as an indicator of both the status and growth of Career Education. The 57 state and extra-state education agencies were requested to furnish information about the existence or non-existence of State Advisory Councils for Career Education or other state level advisory groups that would serve somewhat the same function. Fifty-five states and extra-state jurisdictions responded, as shown in Table VIII. Seventeen, or about 31 percent, of the responding states indicated the existence of a State Advisory Council on Career Education, while 18, or about 33 percent, indicated the existence of a comparable organization.

Collectively, as the data indicate, some 64 percent of the respondent state and extra-state education agencies, have some form of

TABLE VIII

STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS FOR CAREER EDUCATION

STATE	ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR CAREER EDUCATION	COMPARABLE ADVISORY COUNCIL
Alabama	X	
Alaska		X
Arizona	X	
Connecticut		X
Delaware	X	
District of Columbia	X	
Florida		X
Georgia		X
Hawaii	X	
Illinois	Being planned	
Iowa	X	
Kansas		X
Louisiana	X	
Maine	X	
Maryland		X
Massachusetts		In process
Michigan	X	
Minnesota		X
Mississippi		X
Missouri		X
Montana		X
Nevada	X	
New Hampshire		X
New Jersey		X
New Mexico		X
Ohio		X
Oregon	X	
Puerto Rico	X	
Rhode Island	X	
South Carolina		X
South Dakota		X
Texas	X	
Vermont		X
Virgin Islands	X	
Washington	X	
Wyoming	X	

advisory council with which they work in relation to Career Education efforts. This, especially when viewed in the already-mentioned context of recency, is a strong indicator of the growth which has occurred in the Career Education movement. It is also, at the same time, indicative of the status of Career Education and the leadership that has been demonstrated.

Analysis and Synthesis

As an integral part of a recent national conference for State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education*, participants were asked to prepare, in advance of the conference, a brief narrative statement relating to the status and progress of Career Education in their states. The purpose was two-fold: First, it was intended that information of this nature, when synthesized, would provide at least a degree of corroboration and updating of the data that had been obtained. Second, it was intended that information of this type would provide a basis, or a series of bases, for recommendations which might emanate from the conference.

Responses in the form of narrative statements were received from over two-thirds of the states prior to the conference. These were then analyzed and synthesized in a conference working paper by Dr. Robert Crawford and distributed to conference participants for their consideration.

In his analysis, Crawford included the following observations:

- Most of the responding states indicated the existence of a philosophy statement calling for

* "State Leadership in Career Education": Denver, Colorado, April 21-23, 1975. A conference sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers.

integration of Career Education into the total curriculum.

- Most responding states indicated a high degree of public support for Career Education by their chief state school officer.
- Most responding states indicated that implementation activities were occurring most at the elementary levels.
- Career Education is growing and receiving increased attention in the states.
- Career Education has been given a high priority status in many states.

The above observations support the data which have already been presented. They are also quite positive in nature, and lend credence to the idea that Career Education does indeed occupy a status position in the educational arena, and that marked growth has occurred since its inception. Crawford also observed, however, that there are states in which neither the progress nor status has been so pronounced.

While all State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education who attended the Denver Conference had an opportunity to review and react to the analysis and synthesis, specific responsibility to do this in a formal manner was assigned to one of four special work groups. Again, the two-fold purpose (corroboration and recommendations) needs to be kept in mind.

The assigned work group reviewed the paper prepared by Crawford and found itself to be in general agreement with most of the observations made about the status of Career Education. The work group, however, elected to rephrase or restate the observations, as suggested by the following:

- Career Education is growing and receiving an increasing amount of attention in the states;

- Career Education has been given the visible support of the chief state school officer in most states;

- Implementation (of Career Education) activities seem to be most evident in the elementary schools, less evident in the junior high schools, and least evident in the high schools;

- Accurate and meaningful data about Career Education (who, what, how many, etc.) are difficult to obtain and/or report;

- SEA personnel from divisions other than those directly associated with Career Education have not been actively involved in promoting Career Education. [Exceptions noted are vocational educators, who have been promoting Career Education at the junior and senior high levels, guidance people, and elementary specialists.]; and

- Teacher training institutions have not been too active in preparing teachers to utilize the concept of Career Education in their teaching.

As the conference work group reviewed statements and observations concerned with the present status of Career Education, certain needs became apparent. While needs may not be perceived as descriptors of the status, it would seem that the existence, or recognition, of a need or set of needs can provide additional insights into the overall status.

The needs, in the form of recommendations formulated by conference participants, conclude this section.

Recommendations

- <u>Definition</u>

  Each state (in which no commonly accepted definition exists) should develop a definition of Career Education which meets the unique needs of the particular state.

- Determination of Need

  A needs assessment should be conducted in each state to ascertain Career Education needs of the students and the community, as well as the level of sophistication educators have relative to the Career Education concept. (The latter is imperative in planning staff development strategies.)

- SEA Involvement and Position

  A Task Force, composed of policy-makers from each bureau or division of the SEA, and sanctioned by the chief state school officer, should develop an official state policy paper on Career Education for the consideration of and possible endorsement of the State Board of Education, thus providing a framework or foundation for the interdisciplinary responsibilities, for Career Education, at the SEA level.

- Legislative Involvement

  Working through the chief state school officer and the appointed Task Force, efforts should be made to get the Legislature involved to the extent that it will either pass legislation calling for Career Education in the schools or will provide funding for it.

- Teacher Training

  Because Career Education has grown (nationally) from the grass roots up to the university, rather than the concept germinating and being disseminated at the university level, it is imperative that teacher training institutions become full partners in the Career Education movement and provide the kind of pre-service experiences potential teachers need. [Efforts of the chief state school officer can be instrumental in creating awareness in institutions of higher education as to their role in and responsibility (both fiscal and manpower) for Career Education throughout the state.]

- Communication

  Due to the fact that no communications system exists solely for the State Coordinators of Career Education, it is vital that CCSSO

continue the leadership it has established in this regard. Continued support from the USOE in terms of technical assistance is also necessary in order to facilitate the interchange of information between the states.

- Role Definition

  The role and responsibility of each educational level (Federal, State, and SEA) as it relates to Career Education should be clearly defined.

Section Two

Evaluation: Problems, Status, and Prospects

When attempts are made to describe in a meaningful manner the status of an educational endeavor or innovation such as Career Education, it is well and good--and necessary--to make use of quantitative data. It is desirable, helpful, and essential that we know the "how many" aspect of any endeavor. At the same time, however, it is equally desirable, helpful, and essential that we know, with whatever possible degree of certainty, the "how well" aspect of that endeavor.

The first section of this report clearly reflects the kinds of available data that are concerned with the "how many" aspect. Again, data of this nature are necessary. But obviously at some point in time data concerned with the "how well" aspect will also be required.

This section will be concerned with ways in which the states are attempting to continue to gather information relating to the "how many", but more importantly, to their efforts to obtain data relating to the "how well" aspect of Career Education--evaluative processes and procedures. At the same time, some of the more general problems, as well as the prospects, of evaluative endeavors in Career Education will be discussed. Before doing any of these, however, it would seem appropriate to attempt to establish a commonality of understanding about evaluation. The next several paragraphs, therefore, are devoted to the concept of evaluation, its purposes, and its potential.

Purposes and Goals of Evaluation

Traditionally, and perhaps historically, the concept of evaluation has somehow held negative (or at least than positive) connotations for many people. As a result, many people are threatened by the concept, and consequently do what they can avoid having anything to do with it.

Or, with the same feeling of threat, many people will try to find somewhat surreptitious ways of "accomodating" it. This connotation of evaluation is of course unfortunate, but it is understandable. The worker, when "evaluated", may well be out of a job if the results of the "evaluation" are unsatisfactory. And the student, when "evaluated", all too often is confronted with a low mark or grade when the results of the "evaluation" are not at a level consistent with established expectations. Other illustrations could be used, but the point can be made from those noted above: For many people, evaluation has held, with more than a little justification, a meaning of or a distinct association to punishment. "If you don't measure up, you may be fired!" and "If you don't get a high grade in the test, you are in danger of failing the course." Perceptions such as these, unfortunately, are held by some people, and consequently when such people are faced with evaluation, they are apt to avoid it as if it were the plague.

Obviously, the perceptions or connotations noted above are erroneous, and efforts will have to be made to correct them. This is, of course easy enough to state or assert. To change or correct the misperceptions, however, and especially in view of the historical uses which have been made of the concept, is somewhat of a different story.

As implied above, misperceptions and misconceptions will have to be changed. And this is a very real challenge to people in positions of leadership at the state level.

Speaking in the context of evaluating education (but most appropriate in terms of evaluating Career Education), Vlaanderen and Ludka observed:

> If the educational system is to assume responsibilities for and perform the functions that seem essential in modern society, many changes will have to be made in organization, programs,

> support and all other aspects that affect learning environments, opportunities and procedures. In order to determine the adequacy of existing provisions or the appropriateness of proposed modifications, there must also be fundamental changes in procedures for evaluating education and its components and for ensuring the accountability that legitimately is being demanded by many people.[1]

If the above comment were to be paraphrased so as to be directly applicable to Career Education, it would first of all be necessary to point out that as the fundamental change toward implementation of the concept is made, it will be necessary to consider many other changes that will have to be made. Secondly, and most important, it will be necessary to develop strategies aimed at providing the various concerned publics or constituencies with information about the adequacy or appropriateness of the change. In other words, what benefits have resulted from the change? Herein lies the basic purpose of evaluation.

> *The ultimate worth of any evaluation lies in the benefits it provides for students.*[2]

It is both interesting and useful to note the use of the word "worth" in the above quotation, and to compare its use to the definition of evaluation found in the current Webster Merriam Dictionary:

- to determine or fix the value of;
- to determine the significance or worth of usually by careful appraisal and study.

Virtually every current publication dealing with education and its problems will have some reference to evaluation, and will probably contain a definition of the same. Likewise, every dictionary will

---

[1]Russell B. Vlaanderen, and Arthur P. Ludka, "Evaluating Education in a Changing Society", in Emerging State Responsibilities for Education, Edgar L. Morphet and David L. Jesser, eds., Denver, Colorado: Improving State Leadership in Education, 1970, p. 137.

[2]Ibid., p.137.

have a definition. So people involved in evaluative efforts will have ample opportunity to select (or develop) a definition and, by inference, a purpose of or for evaluation. With this in mind, it must be recognized that a degree of divergence is possible. Hopefully, however, all such statements of definition and purpose will be reflective of a statement made recently by Jim Athen, of the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. In his response to a questionnaire concerned with evaluation, Athen observed that in Iowa "the basic purpose of evaluation is to improve, not disprove."[3] This seems to say it and say it well.

Evaluative Efforts at the State Level

At a recent national conference of State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education, the matter of evaluative efforts and procedures was seriously considered by two separate work groups. While no attempt was made to obtain any consensus concerning the purposes and goals of evaluation, the recommendations made by the groups clearly support the thought that continued efforts and continued improvements are essential. For example, one of the work groups first of all identified some areas in which improvements are needed. These include:

- *A survey for more detailed information on what is being accomplished in evaluation to determine the state of the art.*
- *A dialogue to determine existing evaluation instruments for Career Education and a narrative to describe how they are to be used.*
- *Evaluative processes that are developmental and ongoing, that deal with accountability as a cooperative effort for incremental improvement.*

To meet the above needs, the same work group made the following

[3]Jim Athen, Iowa State Department of Education, in personal comment to authors.

recommendations about the several processes and procedures that could be employed:

> *Required evaluation data and information should be provided by awarding agencies prior to awarding contract to proposal developers.*
>
> *Evaluation processes modification is recommended only when outcomes are deemed mutually advantageous.*
>
> *A study be made of the evaluation instruments currently used, their effectiveness, and what needs for instruments still remain. Efforts should be made to fill the voids.*
>
> *Evaluation must address itself to identified goals and objectives and be feasible in terms of time, finances and personnel.*

The second work group concerned with evaluation at the national conference concerned itself more with evaluation as an issue than a specific process. Nonetheless, the guidelines prepared by this group also support the idea that people having responsibilities for Career Education at the state level are very much aware of the need:

- *Because of varying needs and requirements, efforts are being made to: (1) evaluate specific Career Education themes; (2) measure growth in traditional cognitive areas; and/or (3) show relationship in such areas as attendance rates or vandalism. [Until criteria are more specifically outlined, however evaluating these varieties of potential outcomes will continue to be difficult. Acknowledgement should be made of the complexity of evaluating the effects of Career Education.]*

- *If possible, more specific information should be obtained from each state regarding the current status of assessment and evaluation in Career Education. This information would provide a more substantive base than the materials which have thus far been submitted.*

- *Although evaluation studies of student growth are in the minority, reference should be made to the high priority which states are currently placing on this area. [This progress, as embryonic as it might be, should be acknowledged in a status report.]*

- *Although the Handbook prepared by USOE by Development Associates and used in Part D evaluative efforts may have presented problems when attempts have been made by states to use it en toto, it nevertheless represents an effort on the part of national as well as state levels to move toward a more systematic method of evaluation. [Reference to these activities should be stated, thus acknowledging this as a legitimate method rather than a means to meet funding specifications.*

A careful reading of the needs statements, recommendations, and guidelines that were formulated by the working groups clearly indicate, there are concerns about the role and function of evaluation in Career Education efforts. The statements, for example, reflect a recognition of the need for more sophisticated approaches to evaluating all aspects of Career Education, including what has been described as the most important of all aspects--the effect of Career Education on the growth of the student. The need for more specific information concerning information about activities in and among the states has been noted, and the assistance that can be, and has been, provided by the USOE/OCE was succinctly mentioned.

But while the needs and recommendations imply an overall need for continued improvement, they do not imply, nor are they intended to convey, an absence or lack of activities concerned with evaluation of Career Education in the various states.

The Status of Evaluation in the States

As a direct result of the recommendations and guidelines formulated at the Denver conference for State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education[4], an attempt was made to obtain current information about the status of evaluative efforts (concerned with Career Education) in the various states. A questionnaire, designed to obtain pertinent in-

[4] See David L. Jesser, State Leadership in Career Education: A Report of A National Conference. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, May, 1975.

formation relating to various aspects of evaluation of the type generated primarily by the Denver Conference participants, was sent to the Directors/Coordinators of Career Education in each of the states and extra-state jurisdictions. Responses were received from 43 states and extra-state jurisdictions. The information is reported in the following paragraphs and Tables.

State Plans for Evaluation

As noted above, the Directors/Coordinators of Career Education in all states and extra-state jurisdictions were recently asked to respond to a brief questionnaire dealing with the status of Career Education assessment and evaluation in their respective states or jurisdictions. Responses were received from 43 of the 57 jurisdictions, which represents a 74 percent return.

The data presented in Table IX reflect the responses to the question: Does your state have a plan for the evaluation of Career Education?

As the data show, 15 of the responding states indicate the existence of such a plan, while 28 have indicated that such a plan does not exist. Stated in terms of percentages, about 35 percent of the responding states have a plan for evaluation; about 65 percent do not. Most of the state plans, as will be noted, are of fairly recent origin.

At first glance, the above information would seem to indicate a lack of activity, with regard to evaluative efforts, at the state level. There are, however, many indications that this is not necessarily the case. For example, within the "No Plan" responses are to be found statements such as:

- *Not at present.*
- *Evaluation has been conducted independently at each of the 16 Career Education project schools.*

TABLE IX

STATE PLANS RELATING TO EVALUATION
OF CAREER EDUCATION EFFORTS

STATE	STATE PLAN		
	YES	NO	WHEN IMPLEMENTED
Alaska		X	
Arizona	X		1972
Arkansas		X	
California		X	
Canal Zone		X	
Delaware	X		1975
Florida		X	
Georgia		X	
Guam		X	1976
Hawaii	X		1974
Idaho		X	
Illinois	X		1977
Indiana		X	
Iowa		X	1976
Kentucky		X	
Kansas	X		1972
Louisiana	X		1975
Maine		X	
Maryland	X		
Massachusetts		X	
Mississippi	X		1970
Missouri	X		1972
Montana		X	
Nebraska		X	
Nevada		X	
New Hampshire		X	
New Jersey	X		1972
New Mexico	X		1973
North Carclina		X	
North Dakota		X	
Oklahoma		X	
Pennsylvania		X	
Puerto Rico	X		1975
South Carolina	X		1973
South Dakota		X	
Tennessee		X	
Texas	X		1975
Vermont		X	
Virginia		X	
Washington	X		1975
West Virginia		X	
Wisconsin		X	
Wyoming		X	
TOTALS	15	28	

- *Currently in the process of developing a state plan for Career Education.*
- *The SDE will have a funded position for C. E. effective July 1, 1975. From this point on we will be actively involved at the state level.*
- *We have third-party evaluators working with federal projects.*
- *Now being developed.*
- *Our State Plan (5 year) is ready for State Board review. If approved and implemented, an evaluation plan will be developed.*
- *A statewide needs assessment is currently being undertaken to determine the occupational knowledge of sixth- and twelfth-grade students.*
- *A statewide career education assessment is tentatively planned for FY75-76. Subsequent to that, a statewide evaluation system for Career Education undoubtedly will be developed.*
- *No coordinated programmatic evaluations underway yet: individual efforts taking place.*
- *There is no state plan for evaluation of Career Education programs. [However] state consultants in research have assisted local project personnel in developing evaluation components for local projects.*
- *Just getting started on a state plan for Career Education which will include a state plan for evaluation.*

As noted, 65 percent of the responding states and extra-state jurisdictions indicated that state plans for evaluation did not exist. Within that 65 percent, however, were found the above comments, which are indicative of something more than a lack of interest or activity.

Types of Data Being Collected

In order to learn more about the information that currently is being collected, respondents were asked: What types of data are being gathered through Career Education evaluations in your state? (a) Sub-

ject Area Outcomes? (b) Career Education Outcomes? (c) Other?

Thirty-one states or extra-state jurisdictions have indicated that data, in at least one of the three sub-categories noted, are being collected, as is shown in Table X.

It is also evident, from the responses received, that there is considerable interest in acquiring data relating to process as well as product, both in terms of subject area outcomes and Career Education outcomes. Sixteen states indicate that process evaluations relating to subject area outcomes are occurring, while 15 indicate a concern with product evaluations. Twenty-two states indicate the existence of process evaluations in terms of Career Education outcomes, while 26 indicate, in the same sub-category, existence of product evaluations.

It should be noted that the data presented in Table X do not match the data that was used in Table IX. All states, having state plans for evaluation, as shown in Table IX, are included in Table X. In addition, are several others which to date do not have state plans for evaluations. Obviously, in the latter category, evaluative efforts are being made, albeit primarily at the local level as a consequence of local initiatives.

Levels of Occurrence

Information about where (what level) evaluation was taking place was determined to be desirable, and as a result respondents were asked: At what levels are Career Education evaluations and assessments performed in your state? (a) Elementary? (b) Middle School? (c) High School?

The responses, as shown in Table XI, clearly indicate that evaluations of Career Education are occurring throughout the entire range

TABLE X

EVALUATIVE DATA GATHERED

STATE	TYPES OF DATA					
	SUBJECT		CAREER EDUCATION		OTHER	
	Process	Product	Process	Product	Process	Product
Arizona	X	X	X	X	X	X
Arkansas	X	*	X	*		
California	X	X	X	X		
Delaware	X	X	X	X		
Florida	X	X	X	X		
Georgia		X		X		
Guam	X	X	X	X		
Hawaii			X	X		
Idaho			X			
Illinois				X		
Indiana		X		X		
Iowa	X	X	X	X	X	
Kentucky				X		
Kansas	X	X	X	X		
Louisiana		X				
Maryland		X	X	X		
Massachusetts	X		X			
Mississippi	X	X	X	X		
Missouri			X	X		
Nebraska	X	X		X		
New Hampshire	X		X	X		
New Jersey			X	X		
New Mexico				X		
North Carolina		X		X		
Pennsylvania	X		X	X		
Puerto Rico	X	X	X	X		
South Carolina			X	X		
Texas				X		
Virginia	X		X	X		
Washington					X**	X**
Wisconsin			X	X		
Wyoming	X		X			

* In two Title III Projects only.

** Incremental Quality Improvement.

TABLE XI

LEVELS AT WHICH EVALUATION OCCURS

STATE	LEVELS		
	ELEMENTARY	MIDDLE	HIGH SCHOOL
Arizona	X	X	X
Arkansas	X	X	X
California	X	X	X
Delaware		X	
Florida	X	X	X
Georgia	X	X	X
Guam	X	X	X
Hawaii	X	X	X
Illinois	X	X	X
Indiana	X	X	X
Iowa	X	X	X
Kentucky		X	
Kansas	X	X	X
Louisiana	X	X	X
Maryland	X	X	X
Massachusetts	X	X	X
Mississippi	X	X	X
Missouri	X	X	X
Nebraska	X	X	X
Nevada	X	X	X
New Hampshire	X	X	X
New Jersey	X	X	X
New Mexico	X	X	X
North Carolina	X	X	X
North Dakota	X	X	
Puerto Rico	X	X	
South Carolina	X	X	X
Tennessee	X	X	
Texas		X	X
Vermont	X		
Virginia	X	X	X
Washington	X	X	X
Wisconsin	X	X	X
Wyoming	X	X	X

of educational programs in the responding states. It is interesting to observe, however, that more of the activity is taking place in the middle and elementary schools than in the secondary schools. This, in a sense, tends to corroborate an earlier statement about the apparent inverse relationship between Career Education efforts and the educational hierarchy.

Evaluative Instruments and Methods

A fourth avenue of inquiry about evaluation efforts in Career Education had to do with the sources of evaluative instruments as well as the methods or techniques that were employed. Accordingly, respondents were asked: What methods of evaluation of Career Education are utilized in your state? (a) Locally developed instruments? (b) State developed instruments? (c) Standardized instruments? (d) Interview guidelines? (e) Observation guidelines? (f) Other?

The responses, shown in Table XII, again indicate a relatively high degree of activity in evaluation efforts relating to Career Education. As the data (Table XII) show, most of the instruments used for process as well as product evaluations are locally developed (23 - Process; 24 - Product). About half as many evaluative instruments used in Career Education efforts, are state developed (11 - Process; 12 - Product). A slightly higher number (15) of evaluative instruments used for product evaluation are of the standardized variety, while slightly less (8) of the standardized types are used for process evaluation.

In terms of methods (other than the use of instruments) employed, the most common among the responding states is observation in terms of process (14). Next most common is the interview method, and again

TABLE XII

INSTRUMENTS AND METHODS USED FOR EVALUATION

STATE	INSTRUMENTS						METHODS					
	LOCALLY DEVELOPED		STATE DEVELOPED		STANDARD		INTERVIEW		OBSERVATION		OTHER	
	Process	Product	Process	Product	Process	Product	Process	Product	Process	Product	Process	Product
Arizona	X	X	X	X			X				X	
Arkansas	X	X				X	X		X			
California	X	X				X			X			
Delaware	X				X		X		X			
Florida	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		
Georgia	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Guam			X	X		X				X		
Hawaii			X	X								
Idaho	X											
Illinois				X								
Indiana		X						X		X		
Iowa	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Kentucky						X						
Kansas	X	X	X				X		X			
Louisiana			X	X								
Maryland	X	X				X						
Massachusetts	X	X										
Mississippi		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		
Missouri	X	X	X		X		X		X	X		
Nebraska	X	X				X	X	X		X		
New Hampshire	X	X			X	X				X		
New Jersey	X	X			X	X						
New Mexico				X								
North Carolina	X	X			X	X			X	X		
North Dakota		X										
Pennsylvania	X	X							X	X		
Puerto Rico	X	X					X	X				
South Carolina									X	X		
Texas		X										
Vermont	X	X		X								
Virginia	X	X										
Washington	X	X			X	X	X	X	X			
Wisconsin	X	X	X	X								
Wyoming	X		X	X			X		X			
TOTALS	23	24	11	12	8	15	13	8	14	12	2	1

in terms of process. The observation method, in terms of product, is the next most frequently used method (12) while the interview mehtod, for product evaluation, is next.

Observations

The data shown in the preceding four tables (IX - XII) are by no means conclusive. All state education agencies are not represented in the sample, and the instrument used was not all inclusive. It therefore would not be prudent to make or infer any sweeping generalizations about evaluative endeavors insofar as they relate to Career Education. But while the incompleteness of the data precludes generalizations, the data can certainly be used to support the contention or suggestion that was made at the April, 1975 Conference for State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education, viz., that there is a lot more going on than initially meets the eye. At the same time, the data that has been gathered and presented can also be construed as being quite supportive of the guidelines and recommendations formulated by the participants in the Denver conference that were listed earlier in this section.

Section Three

State Legislation for Career Education

As has already been noted and emphasized, the rapidity with which both growth and change have occurred in the area of Career Education renders virtually any description of any aspect of Career Education somewhat inaccurate. The accurate (at the moment) description that is developed on the basis of available information may well require significant modifications as events occur. Such is the case with state legislation relating to Career Education. The description developed for "tomorrow" is likely to be different from that developed for "today". Nevertheless, it is both desirable and essential to know what is happening in this regard at the present time.

According to information received as a result of a current survey of the states, a total of fourteen states (see Table XIII) now have legislative provisions for the inclusion of Career Education in their educational programs. The legislative provisions, it should be noted, range from the very specific and comprehensive to line items for Career Education which are included in the appropriations enacted for education. Regardless of degree of comprehensiveness, however, the fourteen states noted in Table XIII can identify specific legislative provisions for Career Education. At the same time, as also depicted in Table XIII, it is possible to identify six states in which legislation of this nature was pending at the time of the survey.

Collectively, then, a total of 20 states either have enacted or are seriously considering the enactment of specific legislation. Stated in another manner, 35 percent, or one-third of the 57 states and extra-state jurisdictions have some legislation or legislative intent that is concerned quite directly with Career Education. This represents a considerable increase during the past several years, and

TABLE XIII

CAREER EDUCATION LEGISLATION IN THE STATES

STATE	NO LEGISLATION	LEGISLATION PENDING	LEGISLATION PASSED
Alabama	X		
Alaska	X		
American Samoa	X		
Arizona			X
Arkansas			X
California	X		
Canal Zone	X		
Colorado			X
Connecticut		X	
Delaware	X		
Florida			X
Georgia	X		
Guam	X		
Hawaii			X
Idaho		X	
Illinois	X		
Indiana	X		
Iowa			X
Kansas			X
Kentucky		X	
Louisiana			X
Maine	X		
Maryland		X	
Massachusetts	X		
Michigan			X
Minnesota	X		
Mississippi	X		
Missouri	X		
Montana	X		
Nebraska	X		
Nevada	X		
New Hampshire	X		
New Jersey			X
New Mexico	X		
New York	X		
North Carolina	X		
North Dakota	X		
Ohio			X
Oklahoma	X		
Oregon		X	
Pennsylvania		X	
Puerto Rico	X		
Rhode Island	X		
South Carolina	X		
South Dakota	X		
Tennessee	X		
Texas	X		
Trust Territory	X		
Utah	X		
Vermont			X
Virginia			X
Virgin Islands	X		
Washington			X
West Virginia	X		
Wisconsin	X		
Wyoming	X		

may be taken as another indicator of the growth in the interest in and commitment to Career Education which has occurred in the various states.

On the other side of the coin, there are some 37 states and extra-state jurisdictions in which no specific Career Education legislation exists. Of this number, several have indicated a preference for not having legislation that might be perceived as being too restrictive, constraining, or prescriptive. Other states, such as Ohio and Oregon, proceeded to begin implementation of Career Education under the fairly broad provisions of Vocational Education legislation.

Whether state legislation for Career Education is needed would seem to be a rather moot question. Obviously, such legislation has provided the needed and necessary impetus in some states; in others, such legislation is perceived as an impediment. The desirability, therefore, must be considered only in terms of the history, heritage, tradition, and basic philosophy of each individual state.

This is not to imply, however, that individual states in which no state legislation for Career Education exists have no interest in or concern about such legislation. To the contrary, recent telephone contacts with State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education indicate that such interest does exist, and that legislation of this nature is being discussed as a distinct possibility.

Still other indications of the interest in legislation of this type emanated from the National Conference for State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education and other Key SEA Personnel, sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers, and held in Denver, Colorado, April 21, 22, 23, 1975. Participants in this conference revealed considerable interest in Career Education legislation.

The conference report[1] contains recommendations concerning legislation made by three different conference work groups. Such persistence also was apparent with some other recommendations, and at first glance there would appear to be some unnecessary repetition. Jesser, in his summary of conference recommendations, addresses this point, and his comments are worth noting here:

> *But when the recommendations are critically reviewed, and when it is kept in mind that the several groups (A-D and I-VIII) met, functioned, and discussed the issue independently of the other groups, the apparent redundancy becomes a strengthening, as it were, of an expression of need. At the same time, it would seem proper to infer from the apparent redundancy some degree of agreement with regard to the expressed needs.*[2]

One recommendation concerning Career Education legislation came from the group which was considering the status of Career Education. This group made the following recommendation concerning legislative involvement:

> *Working through the Chief State School Officer and the appointed Task Force, efforts should be made to get the Legislature involved to the extent that it will either pass legislation calling for Career Education in the schools or will provide funding for it.*[3]

Another recommendation concerning legislation is to be found in the report of the group which addressed itself to the patterns of growth in Career Education:

> *Legislation for the development and growth of Career Education must be carefully planned. Such legislation must avoid categorical mandates and appropriations which might encourage a bureaucratic and programmatic process for the delivery of Career Education rather than the integrated infusion of Career Education through all disciplines and at all levels.*[4]

---

[1]David L. Jesser, State Leadership In Career Education: Report of A National Conference for State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education and Other Key SEA Personnel, (Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1975), p.5.

[2]Ibid., p. 38.
[3]Ibid., p. 13.
[4]Ibid., p. 18

Still another recommendation concerning legislation is found in a matrix developed by the group which considered constraints and constraint removal.[5] In this matrix is found a recommendation that either a state law or a state policy should be adopted as part of the process for constraint removal.

It is interesting to note that all of the recommendations made at the Denver conference are concerned with legislative action at the state level. It is also interesting and encouraging to note that they also are unselfish and positive in nature. For example, one of the recommendations calls for legislative involvement to recommend and provide funds for Career Education. It is worthwhile to note that this recommendation stresses working through the chief state school officer and a task force made up of policy-makers from each bureau or division of the SEA.

The second recommendation noted above reflects what has to be perceived as an unselfish dedication of key SEA Career Education workers to the integration of Career Education into the total fabric of education. This group of SEA leaders probably would profit personally from the creation of a bureaucratic and programmatic process for the delivery of Career Education more than would any other group. Yet their recommendation stresses careful planning so that legislation will encourage total integration of Career Education into education and at the same time discourage the establishment of a separate bureaucracy for Career Education. The third and final recommendation concerning Career Education that has been noted calls for legitimization of the concept of Career Education by use of a state policy or state law.

Again, the growing degree of interest in or concern about state

[5] Ibid., p. 28.

legislation for Career Education can be seen in the fact that recommendations of the type just noted were generated at a meeting specifically designed by and for the professional educators functioning at the state level.

Although the concerns about legislation referred to above dealt primarily with state legislation, participants in the Denver conference did express interest in the provisions for Career Education in P.L. 93-380, Section 406. This Federal legislation seems to be intended as a response to the various states' interest in and concern for Career Education, and at the same time as a stimulus for Career Education legislation in some states. Several states, in their narrative summaries on Career Education, expressed this opinion.

Again, it is far too early to predict or determine with any degree of accuracy the effect or impact of Federal legislation on state legislation. It seems apparent, however, that there will be some degree of impact.

Analyses of State Legislation

Brief analyses of states' legislative acts concerning Career Education are contained in the following paragraphs. These analyses were done by the writers of this report, and consequently do not reflect any interpretations by the State Career Education Coordinators in the respective states.

Arizona

Arizona's Career Education Legislation is a separate article of law. It was effective on July 1, 1971. One million, nine hundred thousand dollars were appropriated for Career Education. The legis-

lation required that the State Board of Education establish standards for Career Education, but required Career Education for school districts only in order for them to qualify for the special Career Education funds. The legislation approved expenditure of funds for employing additional teacher-coordinators for on-the-job work experiences for pupil-trainees, and for employing apprenticeship coordinators. The legislation did not provide for employing special Career Education personnel, but it required the State Board of Education to set certification standards for teachers, and competency standards for counselors in Career Education programs. The State Board also was required by the act to establish standards for LEA Career Education Program objectives. The legislation did not require use of an advisory council, but funds were appropriated for a statewide program to acquaint and involve parents and the community with Career Education. The legislation approved funds for retraining teachers and counselors for the career orientation of pupils to the world of work. The legislation approved funds for making career testing and counseling available to all high school students, and for instituting a course in orientation to the world of work for grades 7, 8, and 9.

Arkansas

In January, 1973, the Arkansas General Assembly approved for approximately sixty thousand dollars to begin an Office of Career Education within the Office of the Director of Education. The Legislation provided for one professional person and secretary with a forty thousand dollar operating budget with two purposes, (a) to coordinate the Career Education efforts of all the divisions of the Department of Education, (b) to initiate Career Education statewide through the

efforts and cooperation of all the Department of Education supervisory personnel. In December, 1974, the General Assembly omitted Career Education from the budget, but in February, 1975, a special legislative act was passed which reinstated the Office of Career Education and expanded the operating budget to sixty-one thousand, four hundred and seventy-three dollars for each year of the 1975-77 biennium.

Colorado

The Colorado Career Education Legislation is a separate article of law. It became effective on July 1, 1975. The legislation provides a definition of Career Education. Two hundred thousand dollars for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1975, were appropriated by the State General Assembly, but this appropriation is contingent upon a match of two hundred thousand dollars of local funds. The legislation does not provide a mandate for Career Education, but encourages Career Education and provides assistance in the implementation of Career Education in all levels of education. The legislation creates the position of a state coordinator for Career Education, and requires that the State Board of Education appoint a state coordinator, define the duties of the position, and appoint the necessary staff to assist in carrying out these duties. The legislation creates an Executive Committee composed of educational leaders, and charges this Executive Committee with submitting recommendations to the State Board concerning Career Education. The legislation requires that the State Board of Education consider the recommendations of this Executive Committee, approve an annual budget which must be reviewed and recommended by the Executive Committee, adopt regulations for the implementation of Career Education, prepare an annual report of Career Education for

the General Assembly, provide for the establishment of a statewide Career Education resource team composed of successful Career Education workers, and provide for the establishment of a state material resource center. The legislation creates a State Advisory Council for Career Education, instructs that the members be appointed by the Governor, and describes the composition of membership and duties of the Advisory Council. The legislation requires that each school or group of schools must submit an implementation plan to the state coordinator for approval by the Executive Committee and the State Board of Education prior to being eligible to receive the appropriated Career Education funds.

Florida

Florida's Career Education legislation is part of a bill relating to public school finances. This bill provides for Career Education implementation as a categorical program effective July 1, 1973. The legislation does not authorize a specific dollar amount for Career Education, but rather provides that funds for Career Education should be allocated as prescribed annually by the legislature based on a formula involving full time equivalent student membership in grades kindergarten through twelve.

Hawaii

NOTE: The writers have been informed that Hawaii has passed Career Education legislation. However, we do not have a copy of this legislation at the time of this writing. The House Resolution which was presented to the 1974 Hawaii State Legislature requested the University of Hawaii and the Department of Education to support career development in the public school system.

Iowa

Iowa's Career Education legislation requires that each local school district incorporate the concept of Career Education into the total educational program pre-kindergarten through grade twelve. The legislation does not define Career Education, but it makes a distinction between Career Education and Vocational Education, and describes certain essential elements in Career Education.

Kansas

The Kansas Career Education Legislation is a separate resolution of the Legislature during the session of 1974. The legislation does not define Career Education, but does refer to the fact that the State Board of Education already has stated Career Education goals. The legislation directs that the State Board of Education encourage, support, and promote Career Education programs in Kansas school districts, and directs that the State Board of Regents emphasize career awareness in teacher preparation programs. The legislation did not require any specific immediate action except to direct the State Board of Education to prepare and submit to the 1975 legislature a proposed action program including funding details, involvement of teacher education, guidelines for local school districts, in-service for teachers in the field, materials dissemination, evaluation, and any further state-level direction and leadership needed to provide the full benefits of Career Education.

Louisiana

Louisiana Legislation for Career Education is a separate act which provides for a coordinated comprehensive system of Career

Education from the kindergarten level into the higher education level. The legislation was passed during the 1973 regular session of the Legislature, and requires that the State Board of Education and State Department of Education plan, develop and provide a Career Education program to enable students to lead self sufficient, enjoyable lives. To accomplish these goals, the State Board and State Department in cooperation with other educational institutions, are required to provide for Career Education pre-service training and in-service training. The State Board and State Department also are required to implement a plan for providing vocational-technical education as part of Career Education, and the legislation requires that certain steps be taken to accomplish the delivery of such vocational-technical services.

Michigan

Michigan's Career Education Legislation is a separate act, and became effective on May 7, 1974. This legislation provides a definition of Career Education in terms of programs for K-12 students. The legislation did not provide any specific immediate funding, but required that the State Department of Education provide to the Legislature and the Governor by September, 1975, an estimate of the cost for implementing Career Education in the state. The legislation requires that each local educational agency have a comprehensive Career Education plan including performance objectives beginning with the 1975-76 school year, and that the local educational agencies annually evaluate their plans. The legislation requires that the State Board of Education divide the state into Career Education planning districts composed of several school districts as part of the state's efforts

to implement Career Education. The legislation creates a Career Education Advisory Commission, and describes the composition and duties of the Advisory Commission. The legislation requires that the State Board of Education consult with the Advisory Commission and with teacher training institutions to develop a plan for pre-service and in-service personnel development for Career Education. The legislation also requires that the State Department of Education cooperate with other agencies to make available job opportunities information to the Career Education planning districts and local school districts.

New Jersey

New Jersey has funded Career Education under an act which established a Governor's Career Development Project. This act funded Career Education exemplary projects at Model Cities Sites.

Ohio

The State Legislature of Ohio recently passed legislation appropriating funds for general education (HB 155, June 27, 1975). Included in the appropriation is a line item for Career Education which makes available $1.872 million for each year in the next biennium.

Vermont

Vermont has funded Career Education through a line item in the Vocational Education budget. Fifty thousand dollars has been appropriated for Career Education each year since 1973 to be used for grants to schools.

Virginia

Virginia has provided funding for Career Education through a line item in the Vocational Education budget. Two hundred fifty-eight thousand, five hundred twenty-five dollars for the school year 1974-75, and two hundred seventy eight thousand, eight hundred eighty dollars for the school year 1975-76 were appropriated for Career Education.

Washington

Washington has provided one hundred thousand dollars for Career Education through a line item in the K-12 program budget for the 1975-77 biennium. This item also authorizes the Superintendent of Public Instruction to continue operating a Career Education program.

Section Four

Conclusions/Implications

Because of various inadequacies and/or deficiencies that have already been pointed out, it would be improper to include in either the text or summary of this report any sweeping generalizations, based on the data presented, about Career Education. There have been, and are, problems related to describing, in a meaningful manner, the status and progress of Career Education. Again, these have already been noted throughout the report, and consequently need not be repeated here. But even in view of the inadequacies and/or problems, it is possible to obtain a fairly general idea of the status and progress from the data presented. At the same time, those same inadequacies and problems provide the bases for various implications. Both--an idea as to the status and growth of Career Education--and some of the more significant implications are presented in this section.

General Status of Career Education

From the data that are available, one would have to observe that, across the board, the general status of Career Education, as a structured response to a call for educational reform, is good. The data indicate or suggest that there have been increases or gains in the various states with regard to areas such as:

- *SEA positions for Career Education purposes;*
- *Numbers of pupils involved in Career Education efforts;*
- *In-service programs for teachers;*
- *State legislation for Career Education;*
- *Appropriation of state funds for Career Education purposes;*
- *Use of federal monies for Career Education purposes;*

- *State plans for Career Education;*
- *State Advisory Councils for Career Education;*
- *Evaluation techniques and instruments; and*
- *Establishment of Career Education as a priority of the SEA;*

Each of the areas noted represent an area in which growth has taken place. It is not possible, however, to ascertain the degree of growth that has occurred unless one uses zero as a starting point, and arbitrarily assigns the starting point to the year 1968. If this is done, there is some basis for attaching meaning to the data presented in this report. If it is not done, the data are simply data, and of little value.

When 1968 is used as a baseline for developments in the field of Career Education, and if it is assumed* that there was virtually nothing happening at that time in the field of Career Education, the growth or increases that have occurred may be perceived as both significant and impressive. With this in mind, the status of Career Education throughout the nation would seem healthy.

On the other hand, the possibility must be recognized that the entire Career Education movement may be, as has been the case with other educational innovations, a quick and popular response to a set of needs that somehow suddenly became apparent; a highly visible "flash in the pan", or a "big splash".

In this regard, one must infer the need for more, and more substantive and reliable data concerning developments in Career Education. Toward this end, it should be noted that a highly structured effort to obtain the needed data is currently being made by the American

---

*See Career Education: Alive and Well? by David L. Jesser, Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Institutes of Research (AIR) under terms of a contract with the Office of Career Education and the National Advisory Council on Career Education. The data collected by the AIR effort will no doubt serve to add meaning to the data presented in this report, and to the data that will be presented to Congress according to the provisions of Section 406 of P.L. 93-380.

Caveats. In several portions of this report there have been references to cautions or caveats that should be recognized. One such caveat would seem to be in order at this time: In the absence of hard supportive data, one should not infer a lack of commitment to or concern about Career Education at any level of education, and thus in effect denigrate the status of the concept or movement.

Mention has been made of the National Conference for State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education, and a brief resume of developments leading to the conference would seem to reinforce the caveat noted above.*

Prior to the planning sessions, State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education were asked to list, for conference planning purposes, the three most important needs or concerns relating to Career Education in their respective states.

Somewhat predictably, the range of concerns or needs was quite wide, if literal interpretations were to be used. There were, however, several broad clusters of related topics which could be identified, including problems relating to:

- Funding (Federal, State, Local);
- Teacher Preparation (Inservice/Pre-service);
- Assessment and Evaluation;
- Materials (Curriculum and Media);
- State Coordination and Organization;

*David L. Jesser, State Leadership in Career Education, op. cit., pp. 2-5.

- Legislation; and
- Definition

In looking at the seven categories of need that were identified, it seemed obvious that most, if not all, could be perceived in the context of implementation efforts, and as such would certainly imply many questions. The seven broad areas of concerns, therefore, were used in the planning sessions as a basis (or a springboard) for further discussion and consideration.

As the sessions themselves progressed, there occurred what might best be described as a refinement, or in some instances a redirection, of the participants' thinking about the concerns of State Directors/Coordinators. As a result, a similar, but more definitive, list of concerns evolved, and the participants (in the planning sessions) agreed that there existed a strong need to identify, examine, and consider possible strategies which might be useful in dealing with the identified problems or concerns, which were:

- The Development of an Adequate State Plan

  Current legislation (P.L. 93-380) requires that State Career Education plans be developed next year. What should these plans "look like"? What should they include? Who should be involved in the development of the plans?

- Involvement of Key SEA Personnel in Career Education

  Despite the many efforts that have been made to help SEA personnel to understand that the concept of Career Education should permeate all aspects of education [and SEA's], there still remain key SEA people who do not see their functions as relating to Career Education. How can such personnel be more actively involved. How have State Directors/Coordinators addressed this?

- In-service and Pre-service Programs

  As efforts to implement the concept of Career Education are made, the need for expanded in-service and pre-service programs becomes obvious. What is (or should be) the role of the SEA? How can efforts of the SEA be coordinated with those of teacher training institutions? Are there resources for in-service education that are external to the traditional educational establishment?

- Funding

  If there is one universal idea among proponents of Career Education, it surely must relate to funding--the amounts needed, the sources, and

results or effects. What are some ideal funding patterns? What are some real ones? Can funds from a variety of sources be brought to bear on a single problem?

While State Directors/Coordinators participating in the initial meetings agreed that concerns such as these could be profitably considered at a conference, they were concerned about the degree of attention that might be given to the development of strategies which might be used to deal with them. Various conference possibilities, each designed to result in the development and/or recommendation of strategies to deal with the concerns, were discussed by the Coordinators, but a "work-session format", in which the State Directors/Coordinators themselves would have an opportunity to develop position statements and recommendations during the conference, seemed to be most suited to the purposes of the conference. (This approach was subsequently utilized.)

The preceding observations, generated by some 25 State Directors/Coordinators of Career Education, reflect a high degree of insightfulness and perceptiveness in directing attention to the needs and concerns. At the same time, the observations should serve as a fitting capstone to a review of the status of Career Education.

Evaluation of Career Education

As the data indicate, there are various types of evaluative activities taking place in Career Education endeavors around the nation. Some of the activities are occurring as a result or consequence of state plans, but many seem to be happening or occurring without such planning. Materials, methods and instruments used in both process and product evaluations appear to be, for the most part, locally developed in nature. Whether this is good or not good depends in large measure on the perceptions held toward the purposes of evaluation. But so long as instruments, methods, and materials used reflect only local procedures and data, the information gained will likely be of value only to the local situation.

Efforts have been made at both state and national levels to make

it possible for local--and state--practitioners to gather more meaningful and more useful information, and these will no doubt play a crucial role in the entire area of evaluation.

State Efforts. An example of a state education effort to obtain useful information can be found in Career Education: An Initial Look, published in 1973 by the Texas Education Agency. The document was written and published with two basic purposes in mind: (1) To provide a history, as it were, of the Career Education assessment program; and (2) To provide philosophical base for continued development. The Texas effort was concerned primarily with an assessment of need, and provided, ultimately, for the identification of some 177 learner outcomes for Career Education.

The Texas study is but one of several state efforts to conduct both needs assessments and/or evaluations. (Ohio and Connecticut, for example, have provided similar types of assistance.) The Texas study, however, is reported in published form, and consequently is used here as one example of how a state education agency can provide assistance, in the area of evaluation, to local school districts.

National Efforts. With regard to attempts to provide assistance for evaluative efforts from the national level, there are several developments of interest that have taken place recently. Through the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE) a Handbook for the Evaluation of Career Education has been prepared and distributed in draft form by Development Associates, Inc. This document attempts to help both state and local practitioners to:

- *Define and assess Career Education;*
- *Plan for evaluating Career Education;*

- *Design appropriate procedures for evaluating Career Education; and*
- *Implement the evaluation plan.*

Under auspices of the National Institute of Education, the EPIE Education SET (Selection and Evaluation Tools) has been developed and is available for use by local and/or state practitioners. This set of materials (1975), obviously, does not apply to program evaluation, but instead is intended to assist in evaluating, in systematic fashion, the materials that are used in Career Education programs.

Another example of assistance that has been provided from the national level is A Systematic Approach to Evaluating Career Education Materials at the Local Level, (1974) prepared by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. for the U.S. Office of Education. Included in this document are both procedures and a sample instrument that might be used in determining the worth of instructional materials used in Career Education programs.

Initial efforts toward meaningful evaluations and or assessments of Career Education have been implemented, and progress is obviously occurring. As with the general status, however, there is a lack of baseline information with which to make adequate comparisons, both in terms of student outcomes and learner programs.

Implications

This report, concerned with the status and progress of Career Education, can be used as a basis or source for many implications having to do with continued efforts at the state level. The following, drawn from contributions made by State Directors/Coordinators, seem to be an appropriate closure:

- *A basic assumption is that Career Education is needed.*

A needs assessment is necessary to give direction to the direction of Career Education effort. Any needs assessment therefore should be well planned within the proven structure of needs assessment procedures.

- Although Career Education may have been identified as a priority by educators, financial support for this high priority effort has been made available through a variety of funding resources--such as Title III and Vocational Education Part D. At present it appears a need exists to more effectively coordinate the use of the various funds available in and between educational agencies.

- SEA personnel need to reassess, modify, and articulate their roles as educational leaders and assess the strengths and limitations of today's education in meeting the needs of society.

- SEA staff need to agree on a state definition of "Career Education" with which they are to be involved. They also need to identify what they have already been doing in Career Education as a foundation for further development.

- SEA personnel need to view themselves as change agents. Recognizing potential benefits of a Career Education approach, they need to develop Career Education strategies as a team to help local school staffs enhance the teaching/learning process by integrating Career Education concepts activities with their ongoing programs.

- Some states have been using a systematic approach to planning for several years; others are just beginning. Consequently, those states initiating comprehensive planning this year will need to develop new goals, objectives, and program structure. Other states will need to up-date needs assessments and refine existing programs. In either case it is clear that <u>although a comprehensive plan may be complete, it is never final</u>.

PRESENTED TO AND APPROVED BY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP
JUNE 13, 1974, WASHINGTON, D.C.

STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED BY CCSSO COMMITTEE FOR CAREER EDUCATION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

Introduction

At the conclusion of the recent (April 1, 2, and 3) conference on Occupational Education, Vocational Education, and Career Education in Pinehurst, North Carolina, the CCSSO Committee on Career Education was requested to formulate a series of recommendations concerning Career Education that could be considered by the Council at its June meeting. In response to this request, the following recommendations have been developed by the Committee and are herewith presented to the Council for its consideration and appropriate action.

The recommendations of the Committee are included under four separate categories: (1) Definition; (2) Implementation; (3) Research and Evaluation; and (4) Funding. These are discussed in the following paragraphs:

A Definition

The Committee is cognizant of the need for operational definitions of Career Education to be developed within and by the individual states. The Committee is of the opinion, however, that the Council should adopt, as a base, some type of functional definition into which state definitions might fit.

IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED that the Council adopt, or indicate its agreement with, the following tentative definition of Career Education.

> Career Education is essentially an instructional strategy, aimed at improving educational outcomes by relating teaching and learning activities to the concept of career development. Career Education extends the academic world to the world of work. In scope, Career Education encompasses educational experiences beginning with early childhood and continuing throughout the individual's productive life. A complete program of Career Education includes awareness of self and the world of work, broad orientation to occupations (professional and non-professional), in-depth exploration of selected clusters, career preparation, an understanding of the economic system of which jobs are a part, and placement for all students.

Implementation

The Committee recognizes the efforts that have been made in several states on behalf of Career Education, and notes the progress that has been made during the past few years. The Committee, however, is also cognizant of the problems encountered by the states as they have continued their efforts to implement the concept of Career Education on a state-wide basis. It is the opinion of the Committee

that while individual SEA's will need to continue in their leadership roles, the implementation of Career Education in every state could be greatly enhanced through a demonstrable program of support at the national level.

IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED that the Council of Chief State School Officers create a National Career Education Task Force. Such a Task Force would be broadly representative of the educational and business-industry communities, and would be given responsibility for exploring, developing, and recommending strategies relating to legislative guidelines, funding patterns, and research needs.

IT IS ALSO RECOMMENDED that the Council of Chief State School Officers, through its appropriate Committees, continue to seek and support legislation that will encourage and assist in the implementation of Career Education in the United States such as that embodied in Section 407 of S. 1539 (H.R. 69).

IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that the Council of Chief State School Officers, again through the appropriate Committees, i.e., the Career Education Committee, the Legislative Committee, and the NIE Committee, coordinate the efforts currently being made, and to bring them all to bear on the overall problem of implementation.

IT IS STILL FURTHER RECOMMENDED that the Council of Chief State School Officers, as a demonstrable measure of its commitment to the potential of Career Education, adopt a policy calling for the functional inclusion of Career Education programs in all states and extra-state jurisdictions at least by the end of the present decade.

Research and Evaluation Efforts

The Committee fully recognizes the importance of evaluation in any program development of implementation effort. It is important that measures or indications of progress be made or developed; it is equally important that some assessment be made concerning the worth or value of the effort. To some degree, evaluative efforts are taking place. It is the opinion of the Committee, however, that increased attention and emphasis is needed in evaluative efforts in the several states and the nation.

IT IS RECOMMENDED, THEREFORE, that the Council of Chief State School Officers endorse and support the development of strategies designed to assess Career Education efforts in terms of program, process, and product throughout the United States.

IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that the Council of Chief State School Officers, through the appropriate Committees, identify and explore existing sources and the extent of information, and recommend to appropriate agencies (NIE; USOE; etc.) actions which might be taken to eliminate informational gaps.

Funding

The Committee is cognizant of the fact that several states have been able to identify and utilize state appropriated funds for Career Education efforts. The Committee also recognized that other states have been able to utilize federal monies (Voc-Ed funds) to develop and implement Career Education programs. The Committee is of the opinion, however, that the probability of attaining the goals and purposes outlined in the preceding recommendations will be greatly increased if federal funds, specifically earmarked for Career Education purposes, can be made available to the SEA's.

IT IS RECOMMENDED, THEREFORE, that the Council of Chief State School Officers actively seek the establishment of a state grant program that would provide a minimum sum (not less than $100,000) to each SEA for each of the next five years for purposes of Career Education development, implementation, staff preparation, or program expansion.